

March 9-10, 2006
SeaTac Radisson Gateway Hotel
Seattle, WA

March 9, 2005

Members Present:

Rebecca Bowers	Carolyn Bradley
Carol Coar	Gary Cohn
Cathy Davidson for	Roger Erskine
Terry Bergeson	
Sheila Fox	Vicki Frei
Tim Knue	David Koyama
Gloria Mitchell	Kathryn Nelson
Dora Noble	Sharon Okamoto
Grant Pelesky	Karen Rademaker-Simpson
Martha Rice	Ron Scutt
Dennis Sterner	Yvonne Ullas
Stacey Valentin	

Members Absent:

Terry Bergeson

Staff Present:

Jennifer Wallace	Pamela Abbott
Esther Baker	Lin Douglas

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: *To approve the amended minutes of the January 2006 meeting.*
Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: *To approve the agenda.* **Motion carried.**

K-8/K-6 ENDORSEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

Nasue Nishida, PESB Research and Policy Analyst, provided a progress report and lead a discussion on the Future Direction of the committee. Members were given the opportunity to comment on the work of the subcommittee.

The Board asked the committee to look at:

- The impact of the professional certificate on this issue.
- Endorsement policy - knowledge and skills necessary for the credential and reasonable boundaries
- Assignment Policy – how can we reasonably assign people with various credentials?

Some members expressed concern over:

1. The current availability of teachers to teach students to the standards that need to be reached; and
2. The current ability of districts to assign teachers to teach.

The subcommittee may have a recommendation for the board in September 2006.

UPDATE ON DEAF EDUCATION ENDORSEMENT

Dr. Pat Stone, Clinical Assistant Professor of Education, College of Education, Washington State University – Vancouver, and Carol Carrothers, State Coordinator of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services at Washington Sensory Disabilities Services.

With the governance shift that took effect on January 1, 2006, the responsibility of developing an endorsement for teachers of deaf and hard of hearing students shifted from the State Board of Education to the Professional Educator Standards Board.

Nasue Nishida provided a brief update on the issue. Ms. Nishida will be speaking with the Council on Education of the Deaf in the near future.

In developing the endorsement, the Board needs to consider the marketability of these teachers. : :

1. Are we limiting how a teacher can be hired?
2. Are we limiting the districts' ability?

The three policy options the board will consider are:

Option 1. Deaf Education Endorsement. Equivalent to the 33 other endorsements with its own set of endorsement competencies. It would be restrictive as it would only allow a teacher to teach deaf and hard of hearing students. This will be further emphasized by the definition of “Highly Qualified.”

Option 2 – Supplemental endorsement. The endorsement would be supplemental to a foundational endorsement. In order to adopt this, we would need to create new rules. Bilingual and ESL could also be added under this option.

Option 3 – Accept out of state deaf ed endorsement. This option would allow applicants that have received a deaf education endorsement or a Bachelor's or Master's degree from an out of state teacher preparation program approved by the Council for Education of the Deaf to receive an endorsement in Washington without taking a

content knowledge test. This could be a stand alone option or be blended with option 1 or 2.

Beginning September 1, 2005, WSU – Vancouver began developing a program after receiving a 20 month grant from a family foundation to develop a program to prepare teachers of children with hearing loss. Dr. Stone provided information about the program which WSU is slated to offer summer semester 2007. Cohorts will consist of 15 students and the Washington Higher Education Telecommunication System (WHETS) will be utilized frequently to deliver coursework. To be admitted to the program students must hold a K-8 or secondary teaching certificate.

Most teacher preparation programs train teachers to teach in a self contained classroom. This program will be different and take teachers who are certified and train them to teach deaf students in regular classrooms.

Carol Carrothers provided the following data for Washington State:

- About 1300 deaf and hard of hearing students being served by Washington State School Districts (Includes students on a 504 plan or IEP)
- About 100 additional students at Washington School for the Deaf.
- About 450 students are profoundly deaf; and
- About 1000 students are hard of hearing.

Other issues for consideration:

1. At the secondary level, deaf and hard of hearing students are currently assigned to a deaf education classroom for two to three hours a day and then are in mainstream classes for the rest of the day depending on their ability level.
2. To obtain a deaf education endorsement, it takes about 1-2 years in a Master's degree program, with the cost varying from school to school.
3. A deaf education endorsement wouldn't necessarily allow someone to teach in a mainstream classroom as teaching deaf children is different than teaching literacy to mainstream children.
4. Would program approval status be removed from our plate? Council for Exceptional Children and Deaf Education Council currently approves programs.
5. Members questioned whether we could service the students if we had enough deaf education personnel. Most teachers want to teach in self contained classrooms like those found at the school for the deaf where there are plenty of teachers and a waiting list to teach.
6. 12 states do not currently offer approved deaf education programs.
7. How do we do professional certification for deaf education teachers?
8. Members expressed a need for schools to offer American Sign Language at the college level in more schools.
9. Data on statewide/district need. What would the demand be for teachers with this as a supplemental endorsement?

10. In preparing deaf education teachers, there needs to be something to obligate people to stay in state for a period of time.
11. Looking at the transition between those who are currently practicing without an endorsement to obtain an endorsement - performance based to recognize past work.

At the May meeting, members would like to hear:

- from practitioners either in writing or in person; and
- whether there are other viable possibilities?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

The budget passed by the Legislature provided \$511K for alternative routes to teacher certification.

We are in the process of redesigning the website to reflect our new duties and establish who we are.

A one page, double sided; black and white hand out with excerpts from the brochure is ready for members to use. Full color brochures are also available.

Legislators have received the comprehensive analysis and understand that it is to be used as a primer.

Jennifer will present to the Washington Learns K-12 and Higher Ed committee in April.

Members asked if they could receive credit hours for attending the board meetings. Jennifer will ask the Boards and Commissions office about whether or not this is feasible.

Members asked that the Governor increase the diversity on the board when filling vacancies.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Randy Hathaway, Washington School Personnel Association

Mr. Hathaway thanked the board for looking at the K-8/K-6 endorsement. Many of the comments represent the concerns of the School personnel association. Many small school districts are doing the best they can. Mr. Hathaway encouraged the committee to bring in some human resource professionals.

Deaf Education

Placing requirements on school districts may not be fiscally feasible.

K-8/K-6

Randy will encourage the personnel association at their state meeting on March 21st to give feedback on what we might run into if this endorsement were to change. Districts

with less than 3000 students will be impacted far more due to the lack of flexibility they have.

SITE VISIT REPORT FROM CWU TEACHER PRO CERT PROGRAM

Arlene Hett, Mary Jo Larson and Rebecca Bowers provided an update on the Pro Cert site review. Pro Cert programs will be reviewed every three years. The CWU Pro Cert review was performed in October 2005.

Carolyn Bradley shared a concern about approving a program on recommendation of the Certification office even though they have received an unacceptable rating.

Other members have shared the same concern regarding the approval of programs. A committee has been put together to look at the process with the intent to provide recommendations to change the process by which the programs come to the PESB and at one point the PESB is involved.

When these reviews come before the board there are four options:

1. Approve fully;
2. Approve for a year;
3. Approve for two years; or
4. Deny approval.

The Board asked that an additional rating of “needs improvement” be added to the site visit protocol.

MOTION: *To accept the report by PEC which includes the recommendation for approval of the CWU pro Cert program based on RCW 28.8.410.250 (9) (b). **Motion carried with two abstentions.***

MOTION: *To amend the original motion to a one year approval. **Motion carried with two abstentions.***

CITY UNIVERSITY PROPOSED SUPERINTENDENT PROGRAM

Dr. John Armenia, Director, Educational Leadership program for City University introduced the panel. Dr. Margaret Davis, Dean of the school of Education, Dr. Linda Cowan Auburn SD Supt., Jay Hamley, Dr. Armenia provided a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed Superintendent Certification program.

Dr. Linda Cowan discussed the need for this program. Dr. Cowan worked with an advisory group to help City University with their program planning process. The superintendents in the state are aging and many have reached eligibility for retirement.

Diversity is a major emphasis in the school and program. City University is working very hard to embed issues of cultural competency into the curriculum of the program. Not just in verbiage, but practiced all the way through the program. The bigger issue is increasing the numbers of people of color in the administration positions.

MOTION *To approve the recommendation to approve the superintendent preparation program at City University. **Motion carried with five abstentions.***

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND (NCLB) HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHER (HQT) REQUIREMENTS

Lin Douglas and Mary Jo Johnson, OSPI, provided an update on NCLB and HQT. The original HOUSSE process submitted by Washington was rejected. Because of this, Washington has submitted a new proposal.

Dr. Douglas provided the draft HOUSSE forms to the members and Mary Jo Johnson provided an overview of the HOUSSE matrix

The plan is to have all the materials finalized and out to the school districts by the end of March. This proposal was sent to Dept of Ed in November 2005. They have sent a message back saying that they have accepted it as is. This is right in line with what OSPI submitted in November and it is highly unlikely there will be additional changes to what is finalized.

Issues for consideration

- Will special education teachers influence the test the student takes in order to qualify?
- Please send out to higher education program directors and attend the WACTE meeting.
- Highly qualified is assignment dependent.

March 10, 2005

Members Present:

Rebecca Bowers	Carolyn Bradley
Carol Coar	Gary Cohn
Cathy Davidson for	Roger Erskine
Terry Bergeson	
Sheila Fox	Vicki Frei
Tim Knue	David Koyama
Gloria Mitchell	Kathryn Nelson
Dora Noble	Sharon Okamoto
Grant Pelesky	Karen Rademaker-Simpson
Martha Rice	Ron Scutt
Dennis Sterner	Yvonne Ullas
Stacey Valentin	

Members Absent:

Terry Bergeson

Staff Present:

Jennifer Wallace	Pamela Abbott
Esther Baker	Lin Douglas

FIRST PEOPLE'S LANGUAGE/CULTURE CERTIFICATION PILOT PROGRAM

Jennifer Wallace reviewed the topics addressed at the joint meeting on February 24th

1. Status of Government to Government agreement – we have received a letter from the AGs office that provided reassurance that the agreement transfers.
2. Certification process and requirements status?
3. Why were tribes not consulted re: governance change
4. PESB anticipate any WAC changes – technical rule change in May. Extension of the certificate past the analysis date to the end of the school year.
5. Reporting requirements?
6. How will October 31st report be accomplished?

Gary Cohn, Rebecca Bowers, Kay Nelson and David Koyama have agreed to serve on the committee to discuss the program analysis report due October 31st. The committee will look at the end of program analysis. If the board makes a decision to extend the program, make it permanent then the agreement may be re-signed.

In addition to the Tribes who are currently participating, the Nisqually Tribe has expressed an interest in starting a program.

Members expressed an interest to include other tribes throughout the state.

WAC Change

Jennifer Wallace explained that the PESB is seeking to make a technical change to the WACs that were transferred to the PESB from the SBE. The change is merely to search and replace the references to the State Board of Education and replace with Professional Educator Standards Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Suzi Wright, Policy Analyst, Tulalip Tribes. Karen Condon, Collville Tribes and Marsha Winecoop, Spokane Tribes provided public comment to the Board regarding the First People's Language/Culture Certificate.

Key issues were:

- Ten tribes signed the original agreement; there are other tribes interested, but some are not ready to start a program.
- The original agreement was that the agreement was optional. There may be first people's language programs running without certified teachers in each of the 29 tribes in the state of Washington.
- There are currently teachers in line to be certified.
- There is hope among the Tribes that they will be involved in any WAC changes.
- That the PESB and the Tribes continue working together.
- Would like to see the extension for currently certified FPLC/C teachers be extended through the 2006-07 school year.

Government to Government Agreements.

Tribal Leader Congress met on the 22nd of February. The Tribal Leader Congress has suggested that the original documents be altered to include a line to be signed by the PESB.

Subcommittee for the Program Analysis Report.

The Tribes would like to start the subcommittee work soon. Ms. Wright thanked the Board for making the time to work on this. The Tribes requested that Linda Lamb, Bunker Frank, Pat Eirish and Larry Davis participate in the analysis process. Mr. Davis from the State Board of Education has stated that the State Board will not provide reimbursement to staff; therefore the Tribes are requesting that the PESB pay for the state board members/staff to participate.

Upcoming Events

The Centennial Accord is in June. The Tribes would like to show the Governor what has been accomplished so far and would like the PESB to co present.

Arlene Hett, director of Certification, OSPI

Dr. Hett pointed out that the certification office and the PESB staff had already taken care of some issues around processing of the certificates. She also expressed a commitment to spend what ever time is necessary to work through questions that may arise.

Roger Erskine, League of Education Voters

Roger provided members with copies of the new League of Education Voters report, "Turning Promise into Practice." Mr. Erskine encouraged PESB members to share the report among other education professionals and contact him if they would like additional copies.

REVISIONS TO PESB MISSION STATEMENT AND DRAFT PESB ACTION PLAN BASED ON IDENTIFIED GOALS AND PRIORITIES

Mission/Vision

MOTION *To accept the new mission statement with revised language as stated below. **Motion carried.***

The Professional Educator Standards Board Establishes Policies and requirements for the preparation and certification of educational professionals, ensuring that they:

- Are competent in the professional knowledge and practice for which they are certified;
- Have a foundation of skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to help students with diverse needs, abilities, cultural experiences, and learning styles meet or exceed the state learning goals; and
- Are committed to research-based practice and career-long professional development.

The PESB also serves as an advisory body to the superintendent of public instruction on issues related to educator recruitment, hiring, mentoring and support, professional growth, retention, evaluation, and revocation and suspension of licensure.

Ends Policy Development Process

Jennifer Wallace walked the board through the how the board may/will go about developing ends policies that were identified in the comprehensive analysis. Ms. Wallace provided a PowerPoint presentation that included sample policies and the roles the staff, executive director, OSPI and the Board will have in monitoring the ends.

A copy of this presentation may be viewed on the PESB website.

The Board then reviewed the goals and provided feedback for the Executive Director and staff.

GP Approval

MOTION: *To adopt the Governance Policies 1-16. **Motion carried.***

MOTION: *To amend the motion to take out the clause “for the board” paragraph 2 under External Communications. **Motion carried with one abstention.***

MOTION: *To amend the motion by substituting in paragraph 2, under external communication, “When speaking publicly as members of the board, members will support board decisions and policies.” The maker of the motion was asked to consider removing “publicly” The maker of the motion accepted this change. The new amendment will read:*

When speaking publicly as members of the board, members will support board decisions and policies.

Motion carried.

MOTION: *To amend the motion by altering the 4th paragraph under External communications by striking, "Members do not volunteer personal opinions. They may express differing opinions of the Board by such statements as", and replace with, "On issues that have not been adopted as board policy or positions, members may express differing opinions by such statements as".* ***Motion carried.***

MOTION: *To amend the motion by reordering the paragraphs under "External Communications" by removing the last sentence in the 4th paragraph placing it at the end of the 2nd paragraph and move the second paragraph to become the 1st paragraph. The first two paragraphs of External Communications will now read:*

When speaking as members of the board, members will support Board decisions and policies. On issues that have not been adopted as Board policy or positions, members may express differing opinions by such statements as, "Some members of the Board think...and others think..."

Members will not misrepresent an adopted position of the Board and should only speak about Board issues when policy is known and clear and reflects Board consensus. This is not intended to preclude the offering of progress reports to constituent groups.

Motion carried.

GP-6

Determined by general consensus that GP-6 should read "The Chair of the Board ensures the integrity of the Board's processes and normally serves as the Board's official representative"

Assessing Endorsements During Site Visits

Arlene Hett and Larry Lashway provided an update on the work of the subcommittee that is focused on issues related to assessing endorsement programs.

In 2004 the PESB issued a report titled, "Math Teachers Count". In the report the PESB identified the lack of content expertise during the site visits. The PESB recommended that the SBE and PEC work with the deans and colleges of education to develop a formal process and any needed policy change to support the process. In addition, to comply with NCATE, Washington needs to develop a plan to review and approve endorsement programs, or turn it over to the SPA system. (Specialized Program Analysis)

Board members were provided with a draft of the proposed process by which Washington will review and approve endorsement programs. The proposed process

would include a summary of information to be provided to OSPI by the content expert prior to the site visit. As a result of the review at OSPI, the reviewer will identify issues for the site visit team to look into and may make comments on the degree to which the programs have provided evidence. Reviewers are not part of the site visit team.

Members were able to pose questions to Dr. Hett and Mr. Lashway. Key points are as follows:

- Currently programs receive the reviewer's comments after the visit. There may be a benefit to give the program the info before the site visit occurs. This would allow time for the college to address issues prior to the visit.
- When site visits are conducted, it would be nice to have someone identify what someone at the end of a program will know and be able to do.
- OSPI was asked consider meshing the assessments together so the colleges are not put into a burdensome pattern of constant assessment. There is concern over the review and approval of endorsement programs looking like NCATE.
- It was also suggested that OSPI look at programs where students are not doing well on content knowledge assessments and do focused assessments.
- Fix the inconsistency across the endorsements in how the competencies and standards are structured. Condensing of endorsement competencies and/or revise the way we look at the competencies.

Dr. Hett pointed out that the standards are structured based on national organization standards. Currently there is a goal to get the endorsement competencies into a template and make them more uniform.

WEST – E RFP

Esther Baker reviewed the WEST-E RFP Table of Contents with the PESB members.

Members expressed a concern that under 1.3 Minimum Qualifications the 5 year requirement seems arbitrary. Members asked Ms. Baker to change it from required to desired.

Members asked Ms. Baker to provide a list of potential vendors at the May meeting

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kay Nelson adjourned the meeting.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the PESB will occur May 17-18, 2006 at the Red Lion in Pasco, Washington.